



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/628,847	07/28/2003	James Jannard	NOCODE2.005C3	6079

20995 7590 01/30/2007
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

DANG, HUNG XUAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2873

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/30/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 01/30/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/628,847

Applicant(s)

JANNARD ET AL.

Examiner

Hung X. Dang

Art Unit

2873

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. The amendment filed on 11/7/06 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The prior art documents submitted by applicant in the Information disclosure Statements filed on 11/7/06 has been considered and made of record (noted attached copy of form PTO-1449).

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC – 112- 1st Paragraph

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 35, 37 and 38-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The original disclosure do not support for "a printed circuit board supported by the frame, wherein an electrical conduit extends from the speaker through the speaker support and frame to the printed circuit board when the eyeglass is worn by the user." as recited in claims 35 and 37.

Art Unit: 2873

The original disclosure do not support for "at least one lens comprising at least one variable light attenuation assembly configured to change its attenuation of visible light in accordance with an electronic control signal;" as recited in independent claim 38.

The original disclosure do not support for "the electronic control signal is provided to control variable light attenuation of the lens from the interface." as recited in claim 43.

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC - 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14-21, 34 and 38-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Swab et al** (6,769,767) in view of **Bylander** (5,654,786).

Swab et al discloses eyewear with exchangeable temples housing a transceiver forming AD HOC networks with other device comprises eyeglass frame having an interactive device electronic device support by the frame (see figure 1 and the related disclosure).

Swab et al does not disclose the lens configured to have variable light attenuation.

Bylander, however, discloses the lens 50 configured to have variable light attenuation.

Because Swab et al and Bylander are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose of controlling the amount of light that is transmitted through the lens as disclosed by Bylander would have been recognized as an art pertinent art of Swab et al.

It would have been obvious, therefore, at the time the invention was made to a person having skill in the art to construct the eyeglasses frame, such as the one disclosed by Swab et al, with the lens configured to have variable light attenuation, such as disclosed by Bylander for the purpose of controlling the amount of light that is transmitted through the lens.

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC – 103

5. Claims 14-33, 34 and 36-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Swab et al** (6,769,767) in view of **Young** (4,149,780).

Swab et al discloses eyewear with exchangeable temples housing a transceiver forming AD HOC networks with other device comprises eyeglass frame having an interactive device electronic device support by the frame (see figure 1 and the related disclosure).

Swab et al does not disclose the first lens to pivot relative to the frame between at least first and second positions, wherein the lens provides a first magnitude of light attenuation when the first lens is in a first position and less light attenuation when the first lens is pivoted to the second position.

Art Unit: 2873

Young, however, discloses the first lens to pivot relative to the frame between at least first and second positions, wherein the lens provides a first magnitude of light attenuation when the first lens is in a first position and less light attenuation when the first lens is pivoted to the second position (see figure 1 and the related disclosure.)

Because Swab et al and Young are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose of controlling the amount of light that is transmitted through the lens as disclosed by Young would have been recognized as an art pertinent art of Swab et al.

It would have been obvious, therefore, at the time the invention was made to a person having skill in the art to construct the eyeglasses frame, such as the one disclosed by Swab et al, with the first lens to pivot relative to the frame between at least first and second positions, wherein the lens provides a first magnitude of light attenuation when the first lens is in a first position and less light attenuation when the first lens is pivoted to the second position, such as disclosed by Young for the purpose of controlling the amount of light that is transmitted through the lens.

Response To Applicant's Argument

6. Applicant's arguments filed 11/7/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that "Neither Swab, Bylander, nor their combination, teaches or suggests, among other things, a frame having a speaker support coupled to the frame with a coupling and a speaker supported by the speaker support, wherein the coupling is configured such that the speaker may be pivoted over a predetermined distance with

Art Unit: 2873

respect to the frame to position the speaker adjacent the user's ear when worn by the user. For at least this reason alone, Claim 14 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, Claim 14 is also patentable because the Office Action fails to articulate a proper motivation to combine the Swab and Bylander references, and because there is no motivation to combine the Swab and Bylander references. Finally, there is no indicated likelihood of success in combining the cited references." This argument is not persuasive because at least figures 8 and 10 of Swab show that a speaker 60 being pivot over a predetermined distance with respect to the frame to position the speaker adjacent the user's ear when worn by the user. Therefore the claimed invention does not distinguish over the cited art.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the purpose of controlling the amount of light that is transmitted through the lens as disclosed by Bylander would have been recognized as an art pertinent art of Swab et al.

Applicant argued that "Neither Swab, Young, nor their combination, teaches or suggests, among other things, a speaker supported by the frame with a speaker support, wherein the speaker support is configured to allow the speaker to be pivoted

Art Unit: 2873

over a predetermined distance with respect to the frame to position the speaker adjacent the user's ear when worn by the user. For at least these reasons alone, Claims 14 and 22 are patentable over the cited art. In addition, Claims 14 and 22 are also patentable because the Office Action fails to articulate a proper motivation to combine the Swab and Young references, and because there is no motivation to combine the Swab and Young references of success in combining the cited references. Finally, there is no indicated likelihood. This argument is not persuasive because at least figures 8 and 10 of Swab show that a speaker 60 being pivot over a predetermined distance with respect to the frame to position the speaker adjacent the user's ear when worn by the user. Therefore the claimed invention does not distinguish over the cited art.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the purpose of controlling the amount of light that is transmitted through the lens as disclosed by Young would have been recognized as an art pertinent art of Swab et al.

Art Unit: 2873

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Dang at telephone number (571) 272-2326.

1/07

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Hung Dang', with a stylized flourish at the end.

HUNG DANG

PRIMARY EXAMINER

TC 2800